

Serial Number: 10/707,853
Filed: 1/16/2004

babcock ip

Remarks

The Examiner objected to the use of "connector body" in claim 10. Claim 10 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner, replacing "connector body" with "outer conductor seat" in two locations. As a result of the Examiner's suggested amendment, the end clause "between the connector body and the crimp ring" canceled in applicant's previous response dated February 1, 2005 has been reintroduced as originally filed because the Examiner's suggested amendment, above, modifies the clear intent in the claim(s) as described in detail throughout the specification that the compressive force applied to the connector to retain the outer conductor upon the connector body applied is along the longitudinal axis of the coaxial cable "between the connector body and the crimp ring" (see fig. 5).

Further, although the Examiner has not objected to its use, to more definitively define the claim 10 components for consideration on appeal, the term "adapted" has been replaced with "dimensioned".

Because the amendments herein place the application in better form for consideration on appeal, this Response After Final should be entered (37 CFR 1.116)

The Examiner rejected claims 10-13, 15-16, 22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Verespej. The Examiner rejected claims 14, 17-21, 23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Verespej in view of Morino, Pitschi and Caleffi. Where applicable, the Examiner has supplied Verespej for the longitudinal axis compression limitation of the claim(s).

It will be Applicant's primary but not exclusive argument, should appeal become necessary, that the Examiner's reliance upon Verespej is erroneous, as described in detail in Applicant's February 1, 2005 response, in that Verespej fails to supply a reference alone or in combination

Serial Number: 10/707,853
Filed: 1/16/2004

BABCOCK IP

with the other cited references wherein the resulting assembly includes or suggests the limitation that the outer conductor is retained via a compression force applied along a longitudinal axis of the coaxial cable between the connector body and the deformable crimp ring. Therefore, rejection of the claim(s) is improper.

The Examiner's "Response to Applicant's Arguments" with respect to *Verespej* (para 1, page 5 – final rejection) ignores the plain language of the claim(s) whereby the compression force is applied along the longitudinal axis of the cable between the connector body and the crimp ring. Prior to preparation / filing of the present Response After Final, Applicants multiple attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone failed. Several telephone messages were left at the Examiner's telephone number listed in the present final rejection, requesting clarification of why essential limitations of the claims appear to have been ignored. None of Applicant's telephone messages have been acknowledged / returned.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present amendment after final, reconsideration of the claims rejections as described in detail in Applicant's February 1, 2005 Response and a telephone interview at the Examiner's convenience to review the Examiner's rejections in detail with respect to each of the claim limitations and specifically the application of *Verespej*.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew Babcock, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, LLC
24154 Lakeside Dr.
Lake Zurich, IL 60047
Telephone: 847 719-2063
Fax: 847 438-5743

Serial Number: 10/707,853
Filed: 1/16/2004

BABCOCK IP

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No 703 872-9306) on June 14, 2005.*



Andrew D. Babcock